



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,794	01/17/2002	Aviv Refuah	NETEX-P4-US (35817)	1240
44702	7590	08/05/2010		
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROITMAN PC			EXAMINER	
570 LEXINGTON AVENUE			KE, PENG	
FLOOR 17				
NEW YORK, NY 10022-6894				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/05/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jbroitman@ocfbaw.com  
lmurrell@ocfbaw.com  
dflaherty@ocfbaw.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/031,794

**Applicant(s)**

REFUAH, AVIV

**Examiner**

SIMON KE

**Art Unit**

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,6,8-36,38-63 and 79-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,6,8-36,38-63 and 79-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ ~~Notes of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 5/15/10.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-36, 38-63, and 79-88 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 47, 56, and 85 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 5/15/10, Claims 1, 6, 47, 56, and 85 were amended.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-36, 38-63, and 79-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no support in the specification for the added limitation, "enabling a display of a status of the other separately-executing program in the graphical display area of said browser while the user continues to employ said browser." Applicant's support for the added limitation does not teach the limitation. Rather, it teaches displaying the status of the executed command not the status of the application.

As a result, the examiner interprets the limitation to be "enabling a display of the effect of the executing program in the graphical display area of said browser while the user continues to employ said browser."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-51, 53-63, 79 and 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estabrook, Noel (Sams' Teach Yourself Microsoft Internet Explorer 4 in 24 Hours) in view of W3C, Line Browser Commands ("W3C").

In regards to claim 1, Estabrook teaches a method of executing a command entered in a URL field of a computer browser, which command is directed to achieve an action in a separately-executing program other than said browser, comprising: employing a WWW browser having a window with a designated URL field and a graphical display area of said browser(Page

83, "Using the Address Bar" and Figure 9.5 Page 132); receiving a text string representing a command in a format which is neither a standard URL nor a portions thereof, which is entered into said designated URL field of said WWW browser (Page 83, "Using the Address Bar"); and translating, by computer, said command into at least one action to be executed by the other separately-executing program (Page 83, "Using the Address Bar" and page 84 where Estabrook teaches that a user can control other parts of the operating system (i.e. other separately executing programs) such as "control panel," "dial up networking" and etc... via the browser).

enabling a display of the effect of the executing program in the graphical display area of said browser while the user continues to employ said browser. (see Estabrook, page 132, fig. 9.4, fig.9.5)

Estabrook does not specifically disclose a text string that comprises a multiplicity of words and said command is identified according to at least one of said multiplicity of words. W3C teaches, a text string that comprises a multiplicity of words and said command is identified according to at least one of said multiplicity of words (See W3C page 2, search a document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Estabrook with the teachings of W3C and include actions that are comprise of string that are multiple words with the motivation to provide the user with an easier method of performing specific actions.

In regards to claim 5, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein said step of receiving a test string also includes receiving a command directed to modifying a behavior of said WWW browser from a first behavior to a second behavior, such that

presentation of a WWW page under the second behavior would be different than presentation of said WWW page under the first behavior(See W3C page 1).

Claim 6 is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore the rejection of claim 1 is applicable to claim 6. Estabrook-W3C further teach a method according to claim 1, wherein said command is directed to affecting a translation of a future command into an action (Estabrook Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar” and W3C Page 3).

In regards to claim 8, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said action has a physical manifestation outside of any computer hardware of the computer on which the presently-executing program is executing (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood” and W3C Page 4).

In regards to claim 10, Estabrook-W3C teach all the limitations of claim 8. They further teach a method wherein the manifestation comprises printing a file (See W3C Page 4).

In regards to claim 11, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said action is performed on a same computer as is executing said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”).

In regards to claim 12, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said action is performed on a computer remote from a computer executing said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood”).

In regards to claim 13, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said command is translated on a same computer as is executing said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, the commands for the PC are on the PC).

In regards to claim 14, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said command is translated on a computer remote from a computer executing said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood”).

In regards to claim 15, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, comprising parsing said text to yield said command (inherent in Estabrook).

In regards to claim 16, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 15, wherein said parsing is performed on a computer remote from a computer executing said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood”).

In regards to claim 17, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 15, wherein said parsing is performed on a same computer as executes said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, the commands for the PC are on the PC).

In regards to claim 18, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said action is affected by a context for translating said command (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood”).

In regards to claim 19, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 18, wherein said context affects said translation (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood”).

In regards to claim 20, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 18, wherein said context affects a parsing of said text into said command (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood” the command is parsed based on context).

In regards to claim 21, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 18, wherein said context affects one or more parameters associated with said command (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, the command is affected based on which one is chosen).

In regards to claim 22, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 18, wherein said context comprises a virtual personality associated with a user using said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, the current user of the computer has a virtual user associated with him, i.e. logged on user).

In regards to claim 23, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 18, wherein said context comprises a page displayed by said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood”).

In regards to claim 24, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 18, wherein said context comprises a state of at least one software package other than said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. the operating system).

In regards to claim 25, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 24, wherein said software package is executing on a same computer as said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. the operating system).



In regards to claim 26, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 18, wherein said context comprises a current state of affairs (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. the operating system).

In regards to claim 27, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 18, wherein said context comprises a history of a state of affairs (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. the operating system has different history states such as the buttons the user has pressed).

In regards to claim 28, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 27, wherein said history comprises a history of actions by a machine (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. the operating system has different history states such as the buttons the user has pressed).

In regards to claim 29, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 27, wherein said history comprises a history of data display (Page 131-132, “Your History”).

In regards to claim 30, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 27, wherein said history comprises a history of user input (Page 131-132, “Your History”).

In regards to claim 31, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said command has an effect on future actions dictated by future commands (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. my computer).

In regards to claim 32, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said text contains said command in an explicit manner (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “my computer”).

In regards to claim 33, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said text contains said command in an implicit manner (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”).

In regards to claim 34, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 33, wherein said command is determined responsive to an identification of a type of data comprises in the text string (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”).

In regards to claim 35, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said command comprise a natural language format command (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”).

In regards to claim 36, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said command comprises a fixed format command (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”).

In regards to claim 38, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said graphical display area of said browser displays a result of said action (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”).

In regards to claim 39, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said graphical display area of said browser displays a status report on said action (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”).

In regards to claim 40, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said graphical display area of said browser is displayed asynchronously (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”).

In regards to claim 41, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said graphical display area of said browser is generated on a same computer as is executing said browser Page 84, "Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar").

In regards to claim 42, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said graphical display area of said browser is generated on a computer remote from a computer executing said browser (Page 84, "Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar", i.e. "The Internet", and "Network Neighborhood").

In regards to claim 43, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said graphical display area of said browser comprises a request to clarify said action (Page 84, "Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar", i.e. drop down list).

In regards to claim 44, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said graphical display area of said browser is modified in real-time responsive to said command (Page 84, "Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar", i.e. my computer).

In regards to claim 45, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 44, wherein said display comprises a multi-media stream (Page 84, "Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar", i.e. "c:" and "d:").

In regards to claim 46, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said graphical display area of said browser modified a previously displayed data page on said browser Page 84, "Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar", i.e. whatever was on the screen changes to the current command's results).

Claim 47 is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 48, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 47, wherein said string is a standard URL (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar” i.e. (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood”).

In regards to claim 49, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 47, wherein said string is not a standard URL of a browser program executing on the computer (Page 84, i.e. “my computer”).

In regards to claim 50, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 47, wherein providing said text string comprises entering said string in a input field for a URL (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”).

In regards to claim 51, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 47, wherein providing said text string comprises providing said string in parameter position reserved for a URL in a network programming language (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”, and “Network Neighborhood”).

In regards to claim 53, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 47, wherein said language comprises HTML (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”).

In regards to claim 54, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said browser displays live information from the Internet (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”).

In regards to claim 55, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 12, wherein said remote computer communicates with said browser over the Internet (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet”).

Claim 56 is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 57, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 56, wherein said response is displayed by said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar” i.e. shows results for “my computer”).

In regards to claim 58, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 56, wherein said program comprises a program executing on a same machine as said browser (i.e. the operating system).

In regards to claim 59, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 56, wherein said program comprises a program executing on machine remote from a machine executing said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet” other server’s operating systems).

In regards to claim 60, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 59, wherein said two machines are connected via the Internet (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet” other server’s operating systems).

In regards to claim 61, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 56, wherein said command is entered into a URL field of said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”).

In regards to claim 62, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 56, wherein said command is entered by interacting with a graphical display on said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”).

In regards to claim 63, Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 62, wherein said graphical display is generated by a program executing on a computer remote from a

computer executing said browser (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar”, i.e. “The Internet” generated by remote servers).

In regards to claim 79, Estabrook-W3C teach a method according to claim 1, comprising: displaying a page having a plurality of options for making said action; and selecting, by the user, one of said plurality of options, wherein making said action comprising using said one of said plurality of options (Page 84, “Navigate Your PC with the Address Bar” i.e. shows results for “my computer” also “The Internet”, goes to a URL).

In regards to claim 83 Estabrook-W3C teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said action comprises at least one of copying data and modifying files (W3C Page 4).

Claim 84 is similar in scope to claim 83; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 9, 52, 80-82, and 85-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estabrook-W3C.

In regards to claim 9, Estabrook-W3C teach all the limitations of claim 8. They do not specifically teach a method wherein the manifestation comprises making a telephone connection. Official notice is given that it is well known in the art to establish telephone connections using software. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Estabrook-W3C and include the ability to establish a phone connection with the motivation to allow the user to make a phone call more easily.

In regards to claim 52, Estabrook-W3C teach all the limitations of claim 51. They do not specifically teach a method wherein said language comprises Java. Official notice is given that it is well known in the art to have Java commands as inline commands. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Estabrook and W3C and include Java capability with the motivation to provide the user with greater flexibility.

In regards to claim 80, Estabrook-W3C teach all the limitations of claim 1. They do not specifically teach a method wherein said action comprises sending an SMS to a telephone. Official notice is given that it is well known in the art to send SMS to a telephone using software. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Estabrook-W3C and include the ability to establish a phone connection with the motivation to allow the user to send an SMS more easily.

Claim 81 is similar in scope to claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 82 is similar in scope to claim 80; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 85 is similar in scope to claims 1 and 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 86 is similar in scope to claims 1 and 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 87, Estabrook-W3C teach all the limitations of claim 56. They do not specifically teach a method wherein the input to the browser interface comprises personal contact information associated with a person, and the other executing program is a communication program which executes communication with the person associated with the personal contact information entered in the browser interface. Official notice is given that it is

well known in the art to include phone numbers as links and then allow the user to click on the link to call someone. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Estabrook and W3C and clickable phone number links with the motivation to provide the user an easier method of making calls.

With respect to claim 88, Estabrook-W3C teach all the limitations of claim 56. They do not specifically teach a method wherein the input to the browser interface is a product or service name associated with a website for purchasing of the product or service, and the other executing program is a purchasing program of the website for purchasing the product or service, and wherein confirmation of execution of the purchase is returned to the browser interface.. Official notice is given that it is well known in the art to include links in the browser to purchase things. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Estabrook and W3C and clickable links to purchase items with the motivation to provide the user an easier method of making purchases.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 5/15/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments focused on the following:

Whether the limitation "enabling a display of a status of the other separately-executing program in the graphical display area of said browser while the user continues to employ said browser" was supported by the specification?

Examiner believes it is not. In the all the paragraphs that the applicant quoted to support this limitation do not teaches displaying "a status of the other separately-executing program." In



fact, none of the cited paragraphs even contain the word “status.” Furthermore, what these paragraphs seem to teach is displaying the effect of an executing program, which is taught by Estabrook. (see Estabrook, page 132, fig. 9.4, fig.9.5) Therefore, applicant fails to support the limitation “enabling a display of a status of the other separately-executing program in the graphical display area of said browser while the user continues to employ said browser” was taught by the specification.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke  
/Peng Ke/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174